

REMARKS

I. Summary of Office Action

Claims 1-25 are pending in this application.

Claims 16, 18 and 23* have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Great Britain 106,866 (hereinafter "British '866"). Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from British '866 in view of France 1,029,300 (hereinafter "France '300"). Each of claims 19-22 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but allowable subject matter has been indicated.

Claims 1-15, and 23-25* have been allowed.

II. Summary of Applicants' Reply

Applicants note with appreciation the allowance of claims 1-15 and 23-25*, and the indication of allowable subject matter in claims 19-22. Applicants expressly reserve the right to rewrite any one of claims 19-22 in independent form should its respective base claim ultimately not be allowed.

The Examiner's rejections of claims 16-18 and 23 are respectfully traversed.

* Independent claim 23 has been listed as being both rejected and allowed in the Office Action Summary (Form PTOL-326) and in the Detailed Action. Applicants have treated claim 23 as having been rejected in preparing this Reply to Office Action. However, in view of the arguments presented herein, applicants respectfully submit that claim 23 should be allowed.

III. Applicants' Reply to
The Prior Art Rejections

Claims 16, 18 and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by British '866. Claim 17 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being obvious from British '866 in view of France '300. These rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicants' invention, as characterized by claims 16-18 and 23, is directed towards apparatus for displaying a plurality of still images to a viewer in motion, the apparatus including a backboard with the images mounted thereon, and a slitboard. The invention, as defined by these claims, requires that the width of slits in the slitboard be selected to be at most one-tenth of the width of the images in order to project images substantially without blurring.

All of the rejected claims have been rejected based at least in part on British '866. British '866 describes an apparatus including a background to which are applied a number of pictures, and a screen including a series of slots through which a viewer may view portions of the images. The Office Action on page 2 indicates that British '866 teaches that the ratio (P/p) of the width P of the virtual picture to the width p of the actual picture is equal to the ratio (D/d) of

the distance D of the observer from the background to the distance d between the background and the screen (British '866, page 3, lines 10-12). While the $P/p=D/d$ formula provides a guide for determining appropriate dimensions for a display apparatus in accordance with British '866, the reference provides no showing or suggestion of using display apparatus dimensions in accordance with those specified in claims 16-18 and 23.

In particular, British '866 specifies that the slots may have a width of 2 inches and the images a width of 15 inches (page 3, lines 42-43), corresponding to a slot-width to image-width ratio of approximately 0.133. British '866 thereby fails to show or suggest restricting the slot-width to be at most one-tenth the image-width in order to project images substantially without blurring. Indeed, British '866 teaches exceeding applicants' "not-to-exceed" upper limit by at least 33%.

France '300 does not make up the deficiency of British '866 in failing to show or suggest applicants' invention. France '300 was cited by the Examiner for its suggestion of constructing a display device as taught by British '866 along a train track (Office Action, page 3).

However, France '300, taken alone or in combination with British '866, does not show or suggest a display device with a slit width of the dimensions required by applicants' claims 16-18 and 23.

Because neither British '866 nor France '300, nor any other document cited by the Examiner shows or suggests applicants' claimed invention, applicants respectfully submit that claims 16-18 and 23 are patentable. Accordingly, dependent claims 19-22 are also patentable.

IV. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, applicants respectfully submit that this application, including claims 1-25, is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of this application accordingly are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Jeffrey H. Ingerman
Registration No. 31,069
Attorney for Applicants
FISH & NEAVE IP GROUP
ROPES & GRAY LLP
Customer No. 1473
1251 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10020-1105
Tel.: (212) 596-9000
Fax: (212) 596-9090